

Remarks

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the *Final Office Action* dated May 8, 2007 wherein the Patent Office: (1) allowed claims 71, 73, 74, 82-87, 91-94 and 97-103; and (2) rejected claims 104 and 105 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). In response, Applicants hereby request entry of the proposed amendment to claim 104, and reconsideration of the presently claimed application in view of the following remarks.

Status of Claims

Claims 71, 73, 74, 82-87, 91-94, 97-103 and 105 were previously presented.

Claim 104 is currently amended.

Therefore, claims 71, 73, 74, 82-87, 91-94 and 97-105 are currently pending in the application.

Allowed Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the allowance of claims 71, 73, 74, 82-87, 91-94 and 97-103.

Substance of Telephone Conference

On June 29, 2007, Primary Patent Examiner Melur Ramakrishnaiah granted a telephone conference to Applicants' representative Shannon W. Bates to discuss the *Final Office Action*, and specifically, the rejection of claims 104 and 105 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,023,913 to *Monroe*.

Applicants' representative suggested entry of an amendment to claim 104 to overcome the rejection by inserting the word "only" in the last element of the claim, thereby clarifying that the second subsystem may access the stored pre-alarm and/or non-alarm video and/or audio data only if the interface receives an alarm notification from the first subsystem. Applicants' representative

explained that, with this amendment, claims 104 and 105 would distinguish over *Monroe*, which places no conditions or limitations upon access to the stored pre-alarm and/or non-alarm video and/or audio data.

The Primary Patent Examiner agreed to fully consider the proposed amendment and accompanying remarks if presented in a written Response to the Final Office Action. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit the present *Amendment and Response to Final Office Action dated May 8, 2007* for consideration by the Primary Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 § 102(e)

Claims 104 and 105 stand rejected under 35 § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,023,913 to *Monroe*. In response, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 104, as amended, as well as claim 105 that depends therefrom, are neither taught nor suggested by *Monroe*.

As explained in Applicants' response to the *Office Action* dated October 20, 2006, independent claim 104 has a scope similar to allowed claim 84. However, claim 104 differs from claim 84 in a number of respects. First, claim 104 omits a limitation, specifically, "means for storing non-potential alarm specific information related to said premises monitored by said first subsystem, said non-potential alarm specific information useful in determining how to respond to potential alarm condition data," believed to unnecessarily reduce the scope of the claimed invention. Claim 104 further omits the limitation that access to the stored pre-alarm and/or non-alarm video and/or audio data is made available for only a limited period of time. Rather, claim 104 merely requires that receipt, at the interface, of an alarm notification is sufficient to allow access to the stored pre-alarm and/or non-alarm video and/or audio data.

In the present response, Applicants have amended claim 104 to clarify that the second subsystem is allowed to access pre-alarm and/or non-alarm data stored at the interface **only if** the interface has received an alarm notification from the first subsystem. It is submitted that Applicants' interface, as described and claimed herein, is neither taught nor suggested by *Monroe*. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere does *Monroe* teach or suggest that the data stored at the interface would only be available under certain conditions, specifically, the receipt of an alarm notification at the interface. Instead, those passages of *Monroe* cited by the Examiner clearly indicate that no such limitations have been placed on the access of such data by the remote systems. Rather, *Monroe* teaches that the data would be available for review at any time and under any conditions.

As presented herein, Applicants' invention addresses an issue of particular concern: privacy. While one can readily appreciate the many advantages derived from remote monitoring, it should be equally appreciated that such advantages should not come at the cost of a loss of privacy. Specifically, if the remote monitoring station is enabled unlimited access to video data generated at the home, the privacy of the homeowner is severely compromised. To avoid such a result, Applicants' claimed interface is uniquely structured to protect the privacy of the homeowner by limiting access to video data stored at the interface to those times when an alarm notification has been received.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims 71, 73-74, 82-87, 91-94, 97-105 are now in condition for allowance, and therefore, Applicants respectfully request entry of the claim amendments, withdrawal of all remaining rejections, and issuance of a *Notice of Allowance*.

CONCLUSION

Entry of the foregoing amendments, consideration of the accompanying remarks, reconsideration of the application, and withdrawal of the substantive rejections is respectfully requested by Applicants. No new matter is introduced by way of the amendments. It is believed that each ground of rejection raised in the *Final Office Action* dated May 8, 2007 has been fully addressed and the claim amendments will place the application in condition for allowance. If any fee is due as a result of the filing of this paper, please appropriately charge such fee to Deposit Account Number 50-1515 of Conley Rose, P.C., Dallas, Texas. If a petition for extension of time is necessary in order for this paper to be deemed timely filed, please consider this a petition therefore.

If a telephone conference would facilitate the resolution of any issue or expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

Date: July 5, 2007
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330
Plano, Texas 75024
Telephone: (972) 731-2288
Facsimile: (972) 731-2289

Shannon W. Bates
Shannon W. Bates
Registration No. 47,412
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS